United States District Court SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES JOH -7 PM 3: 24

TO: 🛛 U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE / 🔲 U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Janis IC Sammartino		
FROM: D. Sutton , Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 6/6/2013		
CASE NO. 12CV1186-JLS-BLM DOCUMENT FILED BY: Fred Clark, Jr.		
CASE TITLE: Clark v. City of San Diego et al.		
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Ex Parte Application		
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:		
	LOCAL RULE	DISCREPANCY
	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Documents(s) are not timely
X	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memorandum exceed length restrictions
	7.1	Missing table of contents
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
		Supplemental documents require court order
	<u> </u>	Default judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
×	OTHER:	Non-compliance with Local Rule 5.1(a).
Date Forwarded: 6/6/2013		
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:		
The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.		
The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED, and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.		
Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court copy retained by chambers		
Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Civil Local Rule 83.1.		
Dated: 6/7/3 CHAMBERS OF: The Honorable Janis L. Sammartino		
cc: All Parties By:		